

Pragmatic Competence as a Structural Component of Foreign Language Communicative Competence of Students

Sharipov Feruzjon Isor o'gli

Teacher, Department of Methods of Teaching English, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, Tashkent, Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article describes the necessity of conscious inclusion of the theory of politeness as an integral part of the formation of pragmatic competence. The features of trans-actional and interactional communication are considered, and an extension of the concept of "academic discourse" within the framework of teaching foreign languages is also proposed.

Keywords: pragmatic competence, lexical and grammatical competencies language, pragmatics.

Pragmatics, being a fairly fruitful area of modern research, is rarely included in the sphere of practical interests of teachers of foreign languages. Often the level of language proficiency is determined by lexical and grammatical competencies. Pragmatic competence is completely ignored, which can be found for several reasons:

- 1) the pragmatics of the language seems to be vaguer than the grammar;
- 2) pragmatics is a very "delicate area", thus creating difficulties both in teaching and in perception [10]. Grammar is made up of rules. When a speaker follows grammatical rules, he will correctly build speech. The situation with pragmatics is somewhat different, since in pragmatics it is necessary to follow the principles that are applied in different ways in different communicative situations, otherwise they are applied in different areas and may contradict each other [7].

The problem of determining the place of pragmatic competence in the composition of foreign language communicative competence is reflected in the works of many researchers in the field of linguodidactics. For a long time, teaching a foreign language involved learning only the grammar and vocabulary of the target language. However, with the advent of a communicative approach to teaching a foreign language in the second half of the twentieth century, there was a need to master not only linguistic competence (which includes grammar and lexical units), as was previously practiced, but also a number of other competencies. These include pragmatic competence, the place of which in the composition of foreign language communicative competence will be discussed below.

First of all, let's define what pragmatics is as a central significant element of pragmatic competence. Pragmatics is the study of how language is used in communication, in particular, paying attention no longer to what is said, but to how it is said. The term "pragmatics" was introduced by the American philosopher C. Morris, who considered it as an integral part of semiotics along with semantics and syntax (Morris C., 1938).

Whereas semantics asks what a word means by considering it outside of the circumstances and context of use, pragmatics, on the contrary, highlights these very circumstances. Pragmatics is primarily not about sets of rules for the correct formulation of sentences, but about how language is used in communication. Communication involves at least two parties - a speaker and a listener, or a writer and a reader. Therefore, in pragmatics, the interaction of communicants is always considered.

Thus, communication is much more than the encoding of signs by the speaker and their decoding

by the listener. It involves complex processes of interpretation based not only on what is said in terms of meaning, but also on what should be said in terms of the sociocultural situation. Pragmatics in this sense is "the art of analyzing the unspoken" (Yule, G., 1996). The fundamental question in pragmatics is: "What does the speaker (writer) mean by what is said (written) and how is this understood by the listener (or reader) in this situation?" (Leech G.N., 1983).

Moreover, the theory of interpretation of statements must have a dialogical approach. What is said is always addressed in response to what was previously said by someone else. This creates the conditions for what happens in the communication afterwards. What we say or write (in whatever form or situation) creates context for the other person's response, and their response provides even more context for how we respond to that response, and so on.

As mentioned earlier, for a better understanding of pragmatics as a science and, as a result, pragmatic competence, it is worth considering some provisions of pragmatics. One of the fundamental theories in pragmatics is the theory of speech acts. A speech act in linguistics and philosophy of language is a statement that has a performative function in language and communication. According to J.L. Austin, speech acts can be analyzed at three levels (Austin J.L., 1962):

locutionary act, i.e. utterance: the actual utterance and its apparent meaning, including phonetic, factual and ritual actions corresponding to the verbal, syntactic and semantic aspects of any meaningful utterance;

illocutionary act: the pragmatic "illocutionary force" of an utterance, i.e. its intended meaning as an appropriate verbal action in a given sociocultural context;

perlocutionary act: the actual effect of an utterance, such as persuading, intimidating, enlightening, inspiring, or otherwise compelling someone to do or understand something, whether it was intended or not.

Thus, it is obvious that knowledge of the pragmatic norms of a foreign language ensures that the desired perlocutionary act is received from the interlocutor, i.e. ensures effective communication. Another cornerstone of pragmatics is the Brown-Levinson theory of politeness (Levinson, S.C., 1983; 1987). The work of P. Brown and S. Levinson has a two-part division. In the first half, scientists consider the theory of politeness as a whole: its nature and functional apparatus. In the second part, the researchers provide a list of politeness strategies. P. Brown and S. Levinson work with three languages: English, Tamil and Tzeltal. Thanks to these two scientists in pragmatics, namely in the theory of politeness, such a concept as "face" appears. It is worth noting that all interlocutors are interested in maintaining two types of "face" during the interaction: "positive face" and "negative face". P. Brown and S. Levinson define a "positive face" as a person's desire to receive approval and positive evaluation from other people in the process of communication. While the "negative face" is the desire for non-interference in freedom of action by other persons. Using the concept of "face", P. Brown and S. Levinson consider "politeness" as also a phenomenon of a dual nature: "positive politeness" and "negative politeness". "Positive politeness" is expressed by the satisfaction of the "positive face" in two ways: 1) by indicating the similarities between the participants or 2) by expressing an assessment of the interlocutor's self-esteem. "Negative politeness" can also be expressed in two ways. First, it is expressed through maintaining the "face" of the interlocutor (either "negative" or "positive") through face-threatening acts such as providing advice and disapproval. Secondly, there is a way to satisfy the "negative face" when it is indicated that the rights of the interlocutor are not infringed. In other words, politeness is expressed not only in the minimization of threatening acts, but also in the satisfaction of the faces of the interlocutors, regardless of whether the threatening act occurs or not.

Although this theoretical part of their work has the potential to be applied to various types of interaction, P. Brown and S. Levinson's list of politeness strategies mainly covers a certain very

limited type of interaction. The examples they give consist mainly of single statements that suggest clear communicative goals. P. Brown and S. Levinson tend to ignore the fact that most single statements are actually just elements of a longer exchange of remarks between two or more participants. However, understanding the strategies of politeness is extremely important in the formation of pragmatic competence in foreign language learners.

With an indirect approach, the teacher provides the student with the opportunity to play out a given communicative situation, thereby practicing conversational-pragmatic skills. However, one weakness can be identified in this approach: the implementation of the indirect approach is aimed at conveying a message, that is, it is transactional, but not focused on the interlocutor. This idea is developed in the book "The Language Teaching Matrix" [8], where it is indicated that learners of a foreign language should be able to "lead and interpret both transactional and interactive modes of communication." Let us explain the situations of interactional and transactional communication.

The purpose of interactive communication is "to establish or maintain interpersonal contact. At the same time, the desire to achieve a polite mutual understanding prevails. Such communication is focused primarily on the listener. Predominantly, transactional communication aims not only and not so much to establish and maintain contact, but to communicate some information. Such communication is oriented, first of all, to the content plan" [2. S. 89].

The above researchers agree that in the process of teaching a foreign language, it is necessary to combine both approaches. Pragmatic competence is certainly relevant in modern conditions of the dialogue of cultures, since it helps the speaker and the listener to provide an adequate interpretation of speech acts, taking into account the situational relevance of the statement, the sociocultural context, mentality, age, education and social status of the speakers, the relevance and expediency of speech conventions.

The formation of pragmatic competence is associated with goal setting and situation assessment, therefore, as will be shown below, it is a priority component of communicative competence at the initial stage of working with speech material. An indispensable condition for its formation is communication, cooperation, mutual understanding of representatives of different cultures, which is dialogic in nature. The question of how to organize the formation of foreign language pragmatic competence in the absence of a real foreign language environment remains unresolved [3]. As we can see, pragmatic competence is associated with socio-cultural values and communicative behavior.

Researchers involved in the theory of politeness focus on the fact that "the study of linguistic politeness should occupy a key place in the process of learning a foreign language" [9. R. 8]. R. Skollon and S. V. Skollon add that "there is no communication without an individual" [9. R. 49]. In our context, these words can be interpreted as follows: learners of a foreign language must understand and realize why the participants in communication in a given situation speak in this way in this context. This is important in order to consciously approach the choice of your own pragmalinguistic means.

A separate property of methodological models is multiplicity, which implies the presence of several elements at the same hierarchical level of the model. And the last property of methodological models is consistency. This property is reflected in the functioning of the model as a single, organized and efficient system (Voskoboynikov A.E., 2013).

Having considered the properties inherent in the methodological model, we can offer the following understanding of the methodological model: a set of organizational and pedagogical instructions for all participants in the educational process in a structured course of learning.

There are different types of models. If we turn to history, then one of the most ancient learning models is the traditional learning model. The essence of this model is that the teacher directly transfers knowledge to the student. This model puts the teacher at the center, and the students act as passive recipients of the information that the teacher provides. The teacher, as an expert in his

field, must also be an excellent speaker who monitors how the content is absorbed by the students. There are both advantages and disadvantages of this model. On the one hand, the traditional model is very convenient for the direct transfer of information from the teacher to the students. On the other hand, such a model is based on only one type of learning - the banal memorization of material, mainly by ear or repeating notes. This shows its limitations and ineffectiveness in a number of cases, when the student is more kinesthetic, visual, digital than auditory. Nevertheless, despite the shortcomings of this learning model, it finds application in the modern educational process.

References:

1. Kozhukhova, I. V. Interrogative indirect speech acts: implementation of communicative non-impositivity (on the material of English and Russian languages): monograph / I. V. Kozhukhova. - Chelyabinsk: REKPOL, 2012. - 144 p.
2. Orlov, G. A. Modern English speech / G. A. Orlov. - M.: Higher. school, 1991. - 238 p.